

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	IG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/804,342	03/19/2004		Henry G. Johnson	C-2960	7002	
7590 08/24/2007 M. P. Williams 210 Main Street Manchester, CT 06040				EXAM	EXAMINER	
				DOVE, TRACY MAE		
Manchester, CT 00040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1745		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
				08/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/804,342	JOHNSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tracy Dove	1745	•

	Tiacy bove	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	iffidavit, or other evider a compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	12 1 11 10 1 11 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1220 111111111
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amour shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing o	nt of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must b	e filed within two montl	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef, will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 		Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ \ vided below or appended.	vill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	at before or on the date of filing a d sufficient reasons why the affid	Notice of Appeal will <u>no</u> avit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attacl	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the declaration filed 8/15/07 has not been entered. Examiner notes section 716.10 of the MPEP that states it is incumbent upon the inventors named in the application, in response to an inquiry regarding the appropriate inventorship under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or to rebut a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or (e), to provide a satisfactory showing by way of affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 that the inventorship of the application is correct in that the reference discloses subject matter derived from the applicant rather than invented by the author, patentee, or applicant of the published application notwithstanding the authorship of the article or the inventorship of the patent or published application. In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450, 455, 215 USPQ 14, 18 (CCPA 1982) (inquiry is appropriate to clarify any ambiguity created by an article regarding inventorship and it is then incumbent upon the applicant to provide "a satisfactory showing that would lead to a reasonable conclusion that [applicant] is the ... inventor of the subject matter disclosed in the article and claimed in the application).

Applicant argues Keefer does not disclose driving the turbine of a fuel recycle turbocompressor by either the source of hydrogen-rich gas or by the cathode exhaust, but Keefer drives the turbine with anode exhaust. Examiner disagrees. Keefer teaches the fuel-enriched gas stream (anode inlet gas) or fuel-depleted gas stream (anode exhaust gas) may drive a gas turbine system coupled to a compressor (0020).

TRACY DOVE

PRIMARY EXAMINER

8/07